1	Wednesday, 19 June, 1946
2	
3	
4	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL
5	FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building
6	Tokyo, Japan
7	
A 8	The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,
A 8 b r 9 a	at 0930.
m 10	
& 11	
M 12	Appearances:
0	For the Tribunal, same as before.
r 13 s e 14	For the Prosecution Section, same as before.
15	For the Defense Section, same as before.
16	
17	
18	(English to Japanese and Japanese
	to English interpretation was made by MORI,
19	Tomio and SHIMANOUCHI, Toshiro, Sho
20	Onodera acting as Monitor.)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

, 1

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except OKAWA and MATSUOKA, who appear by their respective counsel. Has any counsel any matter to mention to the Tribunal? Mr. Justice Mansfield.

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: If the Tribunal please, at the close of the proceedings yesterday, Captain Kleiman made a statement that he assumed that the affidavits of the Japanese would be in Japanese. In fact, the affidavits of the Japanese are signed in the English version, and at the end of the affidavit there is a certificate to the effect that the translator certifies that he is fully conversant with the Japanese and English languages, and that he, this day, read the foregoing affidavit to the above named so-and-so in Japanese and, in so doing, truly and correctly translated the contents thereof from English into Japanese; and that the said deponent stated to him that the contents of the said affidavit were the truth, and that he was willing to sign said affidavit under oath.

THE PRESIDENT: Each affidavit is under two oaths; is that the position?

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: No, there is only one oath taken. That is, after the affidavit has been taken into Enlish and translated into Japanese, the deponent then takes the oath as to the truthfulness of the affidavit and signs the English affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: Although he cannot understand English?

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: The affidavit is duly translated to him, and there is, of course, the safeguard in that the witness, while in the witness box, will be able to hear the affidavit translated to him.

THE PRESIDENT: The person who assures the Japanese deponent of the contents of the English document is not sworn, is that so?

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: He certifies that the proceedings were duly understood by the deponent and that he truly translated the contents of the affidavit to the deponent before he swore to the contents.

THE PRESIDENT: The Japanese deponent swears on hearsay, and his informant is not him-self sworn.

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: The position is as I have outlined it, and those facts were within

the knowledge of the defense yesterday when Captain Kleiman said he understood to the contrary.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: This procedure was suggested to me by Captain Kleiman, and I thought it was so characterized as to be absurd, and I think it is. You recognize, Mr. Justice Mansfield, that we are making a big concession here, perhaps not without grave misgivings. This matter was debated among us very very seriously for a considerable time. You realize that the witness or the deponent probably, in most cases, said what he did say as the result of a number of leading questions which we would not allow if he were examined in court. For that reason, if we do admit these affidavits, in view of the peculiar circumstances attending them, we will, I venture to say on behalf of my colleagues, insist on a high standard of cross-examination, or of a high standard of answers in cross-examination. You see, the effect of it is that the deponent is allowed to give evidence in response to leading questions.

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: The difficulty of putting a direct -- or having a direct question translated into Japanese is very great owing to the complexities of the language, and that has already,

1000	
1	I think, been demonstrated in the court here.
2	THE PRESIDENT: You may proceed.
3	MR. HAMMACK: Mr. Marshal, will you call
4	Professor OUCHI, please, the next witness.
5	MARSHAL OF THE COURT: Mr. President, the
6	witness will now be sworn.
7	
8	HYOE OUCHI, called as a witness on behalf
9	of the prosecution, being first duly sworn,
10	testified as follows:
11	DIRECT EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. HAMMACK:
13	Q What is your name?
14	A My name is OUCHI, Hyoe.
15	Q I will show you, Mr. OUCHI, an affidavit and
16	ask you to examine it and state whether or not you
17	recognize it.
18	MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, we
19	object to the paper that has been handed to the
20	witness, which has been characterized as an affidavit.
21	The copy served on us is not an affidavit. It is a
22	statement only. We understood the ruling of the
23	Court yesterday to be that an affidavit would be
24	presented to the witness. Now, if the Tribunal
25	please, what we have is not signed, naturally, but

there is a place for the signature of a witness, or of this witness, and the only attestation attached thereto is this statement that it is sworn and subscribed to before the undersigned officer by the above-named OUCHI, Hyoe at the War Ministry Building, Tokyo, Japan, this blank day of June, 1946.

THE PRESIDENT: That is a mere formality which can be overcome if the proper course is followed here. I suggest that the affidavit be read to the Court in English and then to the witness in Japanese and he then be asked to swear to it again, if he can do so. Then you can proceed with your cross-examination. In those circumstances the English version and the Japanese would be admitted tentatively.

MR. FURNESS: I would like to make a further objection to it, that the document which is being read does not even purport to be the statement of this witness; that the statement is in English, in a language which he does not understand.

THE PRESIDENT: That can be cleared up by his answers after he has heard the Japanese version following the English version.

MR. FURNESS: I object further that the translator's certificate is not under oath. I do not know who he is. I do not know what gives him

1	the right to make a certificate not under oath.
2	THE PRESIDENT: The translation will be
3	checked in Court by the Language Section. The
4	objection is overruled.
5	O Do you recognize the document which you hold
6	in your hand, Professor OUCHI?
7	A I have seen it, and there is no mistake
8	that it is mine.
9	Q You signed that document, did you, Professor?
.0	A I did sign it.
1	Q Do you read English, Professor?
2	A I do.
.3	Q Before signing that document, Professor,
4	did you read it in English, and did you understand
5	the language contained therein in English?
.6	A That I did do.
7	Q Was the document also translated in your
8.	presence from English into Japanese by a translator,
.9	Doctor?
0	A Generally, yes.
1	Q And did you understand the Japanese trans-
2	lation from the English, Doctor?
3	A I understood it.
24	Q Are the facts, as set forth in that affidavit,
25	true, Dr. OUCHI?

1	A There is no mistake
2	MR. HAMMACK: At this time, may it please
3	the Court, I offer the affidavit of OUCHI, Hyoe in
4	evidence and ask that it be marked prosecution's
5	next in order.
6	(Whereupon, the document, above
7	referred to, was marked prosecution's
8	exhibit No. 130, for identification.)
9	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: I object, may it please
10	your Honor, on behalf of the defendant HIRANUMA, on
11	the ground it is irrelevant to his case.
12	THE PRESIDENT: Objection noted. The
13	document is admitted.
14	(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit
15	No. 130 was received in evidence.)
16	MR. HAMMACK: The same being No. 130 for
17	the record.
18	(Reading:)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

"INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST 1 "THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al. 2 - AGAINST -3 ARAKI, SADAO, et al. 4 "I, OUCHI, Hyoe, make oath and say as 5 6 follows: "I am presently a professor at the Imperial 7 University of Tokyo, and in such capacity teach 8 economics and public finance. I have been engaged 9 as a professor teaching these subjects for the past 10 27 years. 11 "I was educated in the schools of Japan, 12 beginning with the elementary schools and firishing 13 with the university, eventually receiving the degree 14 Doctor of Law. 15 "As a student in the Japanese schools and 16 later as a professor, I am familiar with the various 17 subjects that were taught from the elementary 18 schools up to and including the university. 19 "Military training and lectures, beginning 20 in the elementary schools, were a part of all 21 schools in Japan. Such training was first insti-22 tuted in the elementary, secondary and normal schools 23 about 1886 and continued thereafter. 24 "Following the Japanese-Chinese War about 25

1898 military training was conducted in the schools by regular Army officers, which system prevailed until about the time of the first World War. After World War I, there was a liberal trend in the school system, and two or three years thereafter little importance was placed upon military training and teachings. Beginning about 1922 military training and teaching was again institued in the schools, these subjects increasingly being given more consideration in the schools until 1927 when such training and teaching became compulsory in the secondary, normal and junior college grade schools. Such training, however, was not compulsory at this time in the university.

"In 1927 the War Ministry demanded that a special course in military lectures be given in the University of Tokyo, this demand being refused, but again made later. On the second occasion demand was made that military lectures and military training be given, as a result of which the university compromised by consenting that military lectures be given, these lectures being given by Army officers assigned from the War Ministry who became part of the faculty. At first the military lectures were not compulsory and most of the students did not

attend them. For this reason a rule was put in effect by the military instructors that a roll call be taken. Further pressure was made upon the students by the rule that if students did not attend the lectures, following their graduation when they were called into Army service they did not receive credit for any military training while in school. This was important for the reason students who participated in military training and lectures while in college had one year's service only to do in the Army on completion of their education, while those who had not attended military lectures and training were required to do their full time of two or three year' military service.

"Upon the insistence of the War Ministry, military training became a part of all universities, including private universities, such training becoming compulsory in 1938 when General ARAKI became Minister of Education. Previous to this time, in 1931, when General ARAKI was War Minister he had demanded that the Imperial University of Tokyo have military training and lectures as a part of its curriculum, which demand was refused by the university officials, thus postponing such training in the university a few years. Later General ARAKI

as Minister of Education ordered compulsory military training and lectures in all universities.

"The military training and lectures were conducted in schools of all grades by regular Army officers, the officers conducting the courses making every effort by lectures, training and propaganda to inspire a militaristic and ultra-nationalistic spirit in the students. It was taught by the military instructors that the Japanese were a superior race, that was productive, and it was Japan's destiny to rule the Far East, and thereafter the whole world, and that the progress of the nation required the students to be prepared for aggressive warfare in the future to accomplish these ends.

"The foundation of the effort to inspire a militaristic and ultra-nationalistic spirit in the students was based upon a rescript of Emperor Meiji on education, published in 1890, which rescript provided that the most important duty of a subject was to the country and the Emperor, together with a rescript issued by the Emperor to military and naval officers, soldiers and sailors on their duties. These rescripts, together with the textbooks, lectures, military training and teachings, were used by the military instructors to teach and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

inculcate in the students a belief in the great glory of Japan, and the duty of the Japanese to aid and further the Holy Mission of Japan to gain control of and rule the Far East, and thereafter the world, and that in the accomplishing of this Holy Mission the greatest glory of all for a Japanese was the privilege of dying in the service of the Emperor.

"That beginning in 1931 domination by the military of the universities and schools increasingly became more apparent, such domination having reached such proportions in 1937 following the China Incident that professors and teachers were required to cooperate fully and wholeheartedly in the program of inculcating in the students a fanatical militaristic and ultra-nationalistic spirit. Failure to cooperate fully in this program would bring punishment by dismissal from the school or imprisonment, all expressions of thought in favor of the ideals of peace or in opposition to the policy of preparation for aggressive warfare being rigidly suppressed in the schools, this suppression being directed to students as well as teachers and professors.

"In 1936 Professor YANIHARA, a Christian

and a leader in the Peace Movement, wrote an article in the magazine Chu-Koron (Central Review) on peace and the ideals of the state. When Marquis KIDO became Minister of Education in 1937, he made demand that Professor YANIHARA be dismissed from the faculty of the Imperial University of Tokyo, and as a result of this demand by Marquis KIDO, Professor YANIHARA was requested by the officials of the University to submit his resignation, which he did.

"In 1937, three professors from Tokyo Imperial University, three from Hosei University, one from Tohoku, some assistant professors and myself were discharged, suspected of being sympathetic to peace ideals. Following the discharge of these professors and assistant professors, all were arrested by the police, charged under the Public Peace Law of suspicion of being in opposition to the political structure of the Empire of Japan. I was arrested by the police on this charge and spent 11 months in the police station where I was questioned in relation to this charge from time to time by police officers, later being sent to another jail to await trial, where I spent seven more months. I was then tried before the

Preparatory Court and as they had no evidence against me I was conditionally released as a suspect. I was again tried in 1940 by a higher court where I was found not guilty. Following my trial in the higher court and the finding of not guilty, I made every effort to be restored to my position as a professor at the university but was unsuccessful. In October 1945, the war then being over, I was requested to return and resume my professorship, which I did.

"As an educator in the universities for the past 27 years and from my own personal experience as a student in the various grade schools in Japan, it is my opinion that the military training, lectures and teaching given to students in all grade schools and universities had the effect of creating in the students a militaristic and ultra-nationalistic spirit, a belief that the Japanese as a race were superior to all other peoples, glorification of war, that wars were productive and necessary for the future welfare of Japan, and had the effect of preparing the students for future wars of aggression."

Signed "Hyoe OUCHI."

OUCHI

W h a l e		MR. HOZUMI: If the Court please, I am here
	2	representing defendants KIDO and TOGO. I would like
	3	to have a cross-examination on the affidavit.
	4	CROSS EXAMINATION
	5	BY MR. HOZUMI:
n	6	Q It is written that you are a holder of the
&	7	degree of Doctor of Laws. Is that true?
Du	8	A That is a mistake in translation. I am
da	9	Bachelor of Laws.
	10	Q You are not a Doctor?
	11	A I am not.
	12	Q In 1937, before you resigned from the uni-
	13	versity, is it true that you specialized in the study
	14	of Marx and Engels and other utilitarian philosophy?
	15	A Of course I did so.
	16	Q Then, the witness, rather than making a
	17	study of such subjects as American capitalism, tended
	18	toward materialistic and communistic thought?
	19	A I cannot grasp the full significance of
	20	your question.
	21	Q Did the witness have any sympathy toward
	22	such subjects as Soviet communism?
	23	A I did not hold any particular sympathy to-
	24	ward such an ideal.
	25	Q On what ground was the witness accused as

3. a criminal defendant? 2 THE PRESIDENT: That question cannot be put. 3 You must cross-examine him on his affidavit. The 4. witness is not a prosecutor. 5 MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, the affidavit contains a statement of this witness that 6 7 he was arrested and was prosecuted. The translation 8 may be a little bad, but he was asking him for what 9 reason was he prosecuted, based upon his affidavit, 10 sir. 1.1 THE PRESIDENT: I understood him to be asked 12 on what ground he made an accusation. I may have 13 misunderstood the question. He may be examined, of 14 course, on his affidavit. I have no desire to re-1.5 strict cross-examination on that. 16 MR. HOZUMI: I shall stick to the affidavit and ask questions within the limits of that affadavit. 1.7 18 Will the witness tell us on what grounds, 19 for what reasons, this criminal case came up? 20 THE PRESIDENT: He is referring, I take it, 21 to the prosecution of the witness. 22 MR. HAMMACK: That is correct, may it please 23 your Honor. The affidavit mentions his arrest.

THE PRESIDENT: Hence my misapprehension

24 25

previously.

25

2.	THE WITNESS: May I answer?
2	MR. HOZUMI: Please.
3	A Legally speaking, it was for violation of
4.	the Peace Preservation Law. That violation the
5	question of that violation was centered around on the
6	books and essays which I wrote.
7	Q What kind of books and essays did you write?
8	A I wrote many essays and many books on such
9	topics; but is it necessary for me to tell you every-
10	thing about these writings of mine?
11	Q Will you mention just those which were
12	questionable at that time?
13	A There were several essays and several books
14	on such topics.
1.5	Q To simplify the answer, may I put the
16	question this way: What kind of thought became a
17	problem at that time?
18	A Generally speaking, they were on daily top-
19	ics and political topics which were discussed in those
50	days.
21	THE MONITOR: Correction: It was a criti-
22	cism against the events in Japan and on world events
23	from the standpoint of liberalism.

Q Was the witness acquainted with such professors as YANAIHARA, TAKAGI, YOKOTA, TANAKA Kotaro?

2.	A Yes, I know them very well.
2	Q These men were also viewed as liberals; but
3	in connection with these men, expellation from the
4.	university was not a problem at the time?
5	A As a matter of fact, Mr. YANAIHARA was
6	about to be expelled on such ground. And as for
7	Mr. TANAKA and others, they were looked upon by the
8	general public as being sympathizers of liberalism.
9	THE MONITOR: Correction: As a matter of
.0	fact, Mr. YANAIHARA was about to be expelled. However,
1	as stated in the affidavit, he himself resigned.
.2	Q YANAIHARA was expelled from the university
.3	not for the reasons stated by the witness, as I under-
.4	stand. It was on grounds of an article written in a
.5	religious magazine of which he was in charge, on a
6	question on passages which were considered as lese
7	majesty.
.8	MR. HAMMACK: To which I object, may it
.9	please your Honor, on the ground it is not a question.
0	THE PRESIDENT: It is in the form of a
1	statement, but I take it he put it to the witness:
5	that was the cause of the dismissal. He should put
3	everything in question form.
4	THE WITNESS: May I answer to that question?

MR. HOZUMI: Yes.

4.

A Considering the reason for the dismissal of Mr. YANAIHARA, it is said that the question centered around a certain essay which he published, contributed to the magazine called "Chu-Koron." The contents of this essay, which was entitled "War and the National Ideals," was such that Mr. YANAIHARA was looked upon as being a pacifist.

Now this, I believe, was the real reason for which he was dismissed from his position.

up what to do about Mr. YANAIHARA. Then Marquis KIDO, then Minister of Education, decided that this essay in the religious magazine was probably the most abhorrent of all these questions. and, therefore, to use that as an excuse to advise him to resign. However, to my belief, that was not the only reason; nor and, in fact, I think the main reason was that it was because Mr. YANAIHARA was a liberal.

Q In the affidavit it is said, regarding the present question, that KIDO, Minister of Education, demanded the resignation of YANAIHARA. How and by what means did the witness learn that his resignation was demanded?

A At that time the matter was referred to me by Dr. NAGAYO, President of the Tokyo Imperial

25

r	
1	University. According to Dr. NAGAYO's explanation,
2	the dismissal was being made on that ground.
3	THE MONITOR: Correction and addition, here:
4.	Therefore, after Dr. NAGAYO explained to me,
5	he asked me to advise YANAIHARA to resign.
6	Q Regarding YANAIHARA's resignation, isn't it
7	so that before his resignation was submitted, a meet-
8	ing of the faculty of the university had been held,
9!	and the matter had been practically decided there?
10	A At that time, there were discussions among
11	the faculty of the university; but at that particular
12	moment, Dr. NAGAYO had not yet made up his mind, and
13	no resolutions were taken.
14	Q I believe that Dr. NAGAYO was the first to
15	ask Professor YANAIHARA to quit; is that so?
16	A As a man responsible for making a decision,
17	Dr. NAGAYO was then put in a very awkward position.
18	On the one hand, he had to take into consideration
19	the opinion of the faculty members, and on the other
50	hand he had to refer the matter to the Minister of
21	Education.
55	Q Is the witness directly aware of the fact
23	that Dr. NAGAYO consulted the Minister of Education?

A I know it very well. At that time Dr.

NAGAYO told me about these things in detail.

200	
1	Q Regarding Professor YANAIHARA's resignation,
2	I wish to ask regarding the procedure in which he re-
3	
	signed. Did he resign after submitting a letter of
4	resignation, or was he forced to resign without sub-
5	mitting such resignation?
6	A In view of the delicacy of the situation at
7	that time, he resigned after we, as friends, gave
8	him certain advice; he voluntarily resigned.
9	Q As a friend, did you advise Professor
10	YANAIHARA to resign?
11	A Yes; I was not against such an advice.
12	THE MONITOR: Correction: I approved or I
13	agreed with that decision.
14	Q Then there is no direct evidence that
25	Minister of Education KIDO directly prevailed upon
16	YANAIHARA to resign?
1.7	THE MONITOR: Correction: Demanded.
18	A No.
19	MR. HOZUMI: Thank you.
20	
21	
55	
23	
24	

Wolf	1	MR. McMANUS: Mr. President and Members of
	2	the Tribunal, at this time, Mr. President, I would
* &	3	like to object, or have my objection noted, to the
s	4	opinions and conclusions that are contained in the
	5	affidavit of this witness. They are not facts, and
pratt	6	I should like my objection noted to those opinions
t	7	and conclusions.
	8	THE PRESIDENT: The objection is noted, but
	9	overruled.
	10	May we have your name?
	11	MR. McMANUS: I beg your pardon.
	12	THE PRESIDENT: What is your name?
	13	MR. McMANUS: My name is McManus, Mr. Presi-
	14	dent, and I am co-counsel with Mr. SUGAWARA, repre-
	15	senting the defendant, General ARAKI.
	16	CROSS-EXAMINATION
	17	BY MR. McMANUS:
	18	Q Mr. OUCHI, could you tell me, please, how
	19	many interviews you had before signing the prosecu-
	20	tion exhibit which purports to be an affidavit by
	21	you?
	22	THE PRESIDENT: That question was disallowed
	23	yesterday; but, since there has been no examination
	24	in chief in court, I think we should allow it today.
	25	A You mean, is it how many times that I had

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	

21

22

23

24

25

seen?

Q Yes.

A I don't remember exactly, but I think it was three times.

Q On the occasions of these interviews, approximately how many people were present at each one?

A The interrogator, one, and others accompanying him, including the interpreter -- two or three.

Q Where were these interviews conducted?

A I think it was room 315 of the War Ministry Building.

THE PRESIDENT: I remind you again, Mr. Mc-Manus, as I reminded other counsel, that we are not a jury and that examination or cross-examination at any length along these lines will not be helpful.

Whatever time we saved by admitting these affidavits will be lost by allowing this type of cross-examination. You can ask him, if you wish, whether any of his replies in his affidavit were prompted by persons around him at the time. The only thing that matters, of course, is the pressure brought to bear upon him when making his affidavit, if there was any, and the extent of the prompting he got, and you can cover that in a few questions.

MR. McMANUS: I am endeavoring to.

try of Education.

24

25

- 3	
1	Q Were you ever accompanied by any friends or
2	acquaintances to these interviews?
3	A I went alone.
4	Q Did you ever discuss the substance of your
5	statement with any of your friends or acquaintances
6	before attending these interviews?
7	A No.
8	Q Did you ever discuss the substance of your
9	statement to either Mr. MATSUHASHI or Mr. OGAWA?
LO	A I do not know these men MATSUHASHI and
1	OGAWA.
.2	Q Were these statements given by you your own
.3	answers, and not supplied by any friends or ac-
4	quaintances, or anyone at all?
.5	A It is so.
6	Q Mr. OUCHI, I note that you state that about
7	in the year 1922 military training was again resumed
.8	in the schools. Can you tell me what branch of the
.9	government was instrumental in reestablishing this
20	policy?
1	A I do not recall the details, but it is
22	generally considered that it was decided after con-
23	sultation between the Ministry of War and the Minis-

Q Can you tell me what branch of the government

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 was responsible for establishing the compulsory training in secondary, normal, and junior grade schools in 1927?

A That, too, I am not aware of accurately, but speaking from general knowledge, I should think it was the Ministry of Education.

Q Do you know, of your own knowledge, whether or not during these years 1922 and 1927, any other Asiatic countries were maintaining or building up a strong military system?

MR. HAMMACK: I object to that phrase, your Honor, on the ground that it is attempted crossexamination of the witness on a subject on which he has not been qualified of having any knowledge, and it is therefore his opinion and conclusion, and therefore beyond the scope of cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not suppose that he should be expected to have a knowledge of those matters, but you can comment on that later. The answer that you want from him you had better get from one of your own witnesses.

- A I have no special knowledge on that subject.
- Q Do you know General ARAKI?
- A I know him by photograph.
- Q Did you ever meet him in 1922 or 1927?

- 1	
1.	A I have never seen him, except in pictures.
2	Q Do you know what position he held in govern-
3	ment service during those years?
4.	A All I know, he was an important figure in
5	the war office.
6	Q Do you know exactly what position he held?
7	A I don't remember exactly, but I don't think
8	he was, at that time, Minister of War.
9	Q Do you know whether or not he was Minister
10	of Education?
1.1	A I think it was in 1938 that he became Minis-
12	ter of Education.
13	Q Then, I take it, you state that in 1922 and
14	1927 you know that General ARAKI was not Minister of
1.5	War and not Minister of Education, is that so?
16	THE PRESIDENT: General ARAKI's record is
1.7	already before the Court.
18	A I don't think he was either.
19	Q Now you mentioned, Mr. OUCHI, that in 1931
20	General ARAKI as War Minister demanded military
21	lectures at the Imperial University. When the
55	University refused, was anything further done about
23	this situation?
24	THE INTERPRETER: Was 1t 1931?
25	MR. McMANUS: 1931.

J.

4.

1.1

1.5

1.7

A	I	thir	ık	you	will	fir	nd it	was	the	6 t h	Year	of
Showa.	I	don	t	thi	nk I	have	said	any	thin	g ab	out	
what po	sit	tion	AR	AKI	held	in	1931	nor	wha	t he	de-	
manded	of	the	Un	ive	rsity	by	virtı	e of	the	pos	ition	ı
he held	i .											

Q You state now, Mr. OUCHI, that you did not say anything concerning General ARAKI in 1931, while he was War Minister?

A I think it was in 1933, when ARAKI was War Minister, that through the Ministry of Education he asked that military training in the University be intensified through an increase in the military instruction personnel. This representation was flatly refused by the then President, ONOZUKA, saying that this demand was not in accordance with the former agreements between the University and the Ministry of Education.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1049, a recess was taken until 1105. At this point Hidekazu Hayashi replaced Sho Onodera as Monitor, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

3.

2

3

4.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

G
0
1
d
b
0
r
8
&
Y
0
1
d
е
n

THE	MARSHAL:	The	T	ribunal	is	now	resumed.
THE	PRESIDENT	: M	r.	McManus	· .		

BY MR. McMANUS (Continuing):

Mr. OUCHI, just before recess you stated that you did not recollect making any statement concerning General ARAKI in 1931. Now, did you or did you not make such a statement?

A I did not make any statement regarding General ARAKI in 1931.

Q You stated this morning that this affidavit was true and correct and that everything was true therein. Do you still maintain that thought?

A I do.

MR. McMANUS: If the Court will bear with me, may I read a short paragraph from this statement?

THE PRESIDENT: You may put it to him, yes.

Q I ask you whether or not, Mr. OUCHI, you made this statement to the prosecutor when you were interviewed: "Upon the insistence of the War Ministry, military training became a part of all universities, including private universities, such training becoming compulsory in 1938 when General ARAKI became Minister of Education. Previous to this time, in 1931, when General ARAKI was War Minister he had demanded that the Imperial University of Tokyo have military

13

1.5 16

1.7 18

19

50

22

23

24

25

3.	training and lectures as a part of its curriculum,
2	which demand was refused by the university officials,
3	thus postponing such training in the university a
4	few years. Later General ARAKI as Minister of
5	Education ordered compulsory military training and
6	lectures in all universities." Did you make that
7	statement?
3	A I said as read.
9	Q Well, you just told me that you made no
10	statement concerning General ARAKI in 1931. Now,
1.1	which is correct?
1.2	A May I have the date the year 1931 repeated?
13	I do not understand the connection between that and
1.4	the 6th Year of Showa.
1.5	n Does the witness want me to repeat the
16	excerpt that I read from this document? Is that his
1.7	request?
18	THE PRESIDENT: There is no need to read it
19	again.
50	MR. McMANUS: I beg your pardon, Mr. President.
21	THE PRESIDENT: I think you are at cross
55	purposes somehow.
23	O Do you say now that the statement as read
24	is the truth?
25	. A The date is not clear, but the facts are clear.

3.

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

55

23

24

25

Q	Well, after General ARAKI requested the
Tokyo Imp	perial University to install military train-
ing, for	the next several years was any military
training	installed in Tokyo University?
A	It was carried out.
Ċ	When?
A	Military training as a lecture was intro-
duced in	the University in the year 1925. It was
introduce	ed formally as military training in the
year 1939	There were two types of military train-
ing.	

Q So the military training demanded by General ARAKI in 1931 was not carried out until 1939, is that correct?

A Military training using guns or rifles
was not compulsory until 1939. However, military
training as a lecture has been carried out since 1925.

Q What type of training was requested by General ARAKI in 1931?

A I am not fully aware of the contents of the matter demanded by ARAKI, but military training as carried out in the University was such that, instead of using guns, the training was conducted in lecture rooms in the form of lectures on such subjects as the History of War, Tactics, and also hours of such

25

done from time to time.

J.	lectures were increased.
2	Q That type of training was refused by Tokyo
3	Imperial University in 1931?
4.	A Military training using rifles was rejected,
5	and also the assignment of an increased number of
6	officers was also rejected.
7	Q Now, after 1931, was General ARAKI or did
8	General ARAKI continue as War Minister for a number of
9	years?
10	A I do not fully recall the exact period, as
3.1	I said before; but, insofar as the present problem is
12	concerned, I recall that the University rejected the
13	demand, not in 1931 but in 1933.
14	O Do you know whether or not, while General
15	ARAKI was still War Minister after this period, any
16	other request was made by him to have this military
1.7	training?
18	A The matter does not have any connection with
19	War Minister ARAKI, but it is a fact that the War
20	Ministry through the Education Ministry demanded the
21	increase in hours for military training.
55	Q When?
23	A I do not know the accurate dates, but it was

THE MONITOR: Correction: "frequently."

1	0 Now, in 1938, Mr. OUCHI, was this military
2	training set and formulated by the War Ministry?
3	A I think it was formulated by the Education
4.	Ministry after the demand was presented by the
5	Ministry of War.
6	9 So, do I understand you then to mean that the
7	Minister of Education merely carried out the dictates
8	of the War Ministry in formulating this military
9	training program?
10	A Formally it is not so; but, as a matter of
11	practice, it is so to a very great extent.
12	Q Well, was it so in 1938?
13	A Military training became compulsory from
14	the 14th Year of Showa, or 1939.
15	Q I note also, Mr. OUCHI, that you state that
16	textbooks and lectures were used by the military in-
1.7	structors to inculcate in students a desire to gain
18	control of the Far East and thereafter the world.
19	Is this your own opinion?
50	A It is not they are not my views, but the
21	statement is made on the basis of the facts which
22	were brought to my attention by my students.
23	Q Did you ever attend any of these lectures?
24	A I have looked into the lecture rooms, but I
25	have myself never heard a lecture.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
27	

23

24

25

O Then I understand, is it so, that you base your opinion solely on the statements of students who have attended these lectures?

A It is not so. Considering the thought which prevailed at that time in the Japanese thought world at that time, I should say that the views which were entertained by the so-called militarists, their words were conveyed in these lectures to the students.

Q And your knowledge of that is being told by the said students, is that correct?

A It is from the students that I directly heard the contents of the lectures.

Q Did any students in these words ever tell you the theory which you now possess, that they were inculcated with a desire to gain control of the Far East and thereafter the world?

- A It is as you say.
- Q Can you name some of these students, please?
- A That I cannot do right away; but, if desired,
 I can write down a number of names.

THE PRESIDENT: You had better put your questions with greater rapidity, Mr. McManus. We cannot sit here all day waiting for you.

25

A b r	1	MR. McMANUS: I have just a few more
	2	questions, if the Court please.
a m	3	Q You stated, Mr. OUCHI, that you were a
&	4	liberalist. Did your beliefs in liberalism advocate
M	5	the overthrow of the Japanese government at any time?
r	6	A Do you mean me personally?
e e	7	Q Yes.
	8	A There has never been such a case.
	9	Q Did you ever belong to any organization who
	10	advocated this theory?
	11	A Absolutely not.
	12	Q Do you claim that General ARAKI was in any
	13	way responsible for your incarceration in 1937?
	14	A I think there was a mistake in the date.
	15	The year was 1938, and I don't think General ARAKI
	16	was in any way connected with it.
	17	MR. McMANUS: I have no further questions.
	18	THE PRESIDENT: Who do you represent? (Address-
	19	ing Japanese counsel at the microphone.)
	20	MR. OKUYAMA: I am OKUYAMA, Hachiro, counsel
	21	for the defendant NAGANO, Osami. Regarding the matter
	22	of the writing in the affidavit of the present
	23	witness, I should like to make some points clear.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. OKUYAMA:

Q I should like to present my question to the witness. In the eighth line from the bottom of page 1 in the Japanese translation of the affidavit, the following statement is set forth: "Military training and lectures, beginning in the elementary schools, were a part of all schools in Japan. Such training was first instituted in the elementary, secondary and normal schools about 1886 and continued thereafter." Regarding the contents of such military training, were there any aspects which when viewed actually should not properly be called military training?

A This is a question of the meaning of the words. In general, the conception of war and the methods of war were spoken of but I cannot say that this was what was later, that is to say, in the last ten years, taught, is not the same as the militaristic teaching that was made in these last ten years.

Q At that time, in 1886, what was military training termed in Japan?

A Only physical drill.

Q Was it not called simply physical exercise or drill and military drill?

3

4.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A Yes, that is so.

Q Was it not the famous MORI, Yurei who introduced this subject as physical exercise in the schools?

A I think it is so.

Q Was not this man, MORI, Yurei, the most progressive liberal in Japan at the time, who advocated the use of English?

A Exactly so.

Q Was not the purpose of the Educational
Minister, MORI, in adopting this system, to lift
the people of Japan from the feudalism from which
they had been liberated and to discipline them as
social beings and to foster the spirit of cooperation
and to train them as a new people?

was a liberal, and he was also a patriot. As a patriot he believed that for the future of Japan it was necessary that Japanese armed forces should be strong. On one side he wanted to inculcate discipline into the Japanese people. On the other hand he wanted to convince them that it was -- a strong defense was necessary for the country.

MONITOR: Correction: Training was necessary for the national defense.

1.5

Q May I ask again: The desire of MORI, Yurei, was to have such training for the purposes of national defense?

A It is so.

Q On the latter part of the first page of the Japanese version of the affidavit, the following lines are to be found: "Following the Japanese-Chinese War about 1898 military training was conducted in the schools by regular Army officers, which system prevailed until about the time of the first World War." Is not this a mistake?

A This is a mistake. It was not active but retired officers.

MONITOR: Correction: Reserve officer.

Q Not only reserve army officers, but in the country districts were not there also non-commissioned officers and plain soldiers?

A It is so.

Q On page 2, top of page 2 in the Japanese version, there are these words: "Beginning about 1922 military training and teaching was again instituted in the schools." Is there not a mistake there? Was it not in 1925?

A The matter was taken up in 1923 and up to 1925.

MONITOR: Correction: And put in force from 1925.

Q Next I wish to quote from beginning from
the seventh line, second page of the Japanese text:
"These subjects increasingly being given more consideration in the schools until 1927 when such training and teaching became compulsory in the secondary, normal and junior college grade schools."
Will you tell me the reasons why it became compulsory?

A These reasons are not simple. On one hand, as the result of disarmament by the Washington Conference, many army officers had to be discharged, became over-abundant, and the army wished to be able to keep good material. On the other hand, as a reaction following disarmament, pacifist ideas grew, and it was feared that social unrest, social disorder, might come from this; and to counteract this tendency the strengthening of military ideas and military training was advocated.

Q Among the reasons why the Ministry of Education made military training compulsory, can you say that one of the purposes was domination of the world?

A In the beginning, when the Ministry of Education instituted military training, there was

no such conscious intention. However, around	1939,
when it became generally compulsory, and there	eafter
when the Pacific war, when the war in the Pac	ific
was becoming probable, intensified, this idea	became
prevalent in education this idea was also	woven
into education.	

Q In the witness' present words, he said to the effect "such thought." Could the witness clarify those words?

A I shall. Allow me to repeat what I said.

I declared that the ideas expressed at that time were that war was productive, and, at the same time, that Japan's superior position in Asia must lead her -- give her the duty or the responsibility to establish an Eastern Asia cooperative spirit.

MONITOR: Co-proseperity sphere.

Q Can you say that such ideas prevailed after 1939 or before?

A It is impossible to put limits to the progress of ideas. It can only be said that these ideas developed greatly after 1939.

Q Then may I quote again from page 3 of the Japanese version of the affidavit: "If students did not attend the lectures, following their graduation when they were called into Army service they did not

receive credit for any military training while in school. This was important for the reason students who participated in military training and lectures while in college had one year's service only to do in the Army on completion of their education, while those who had not attended military lectures and training were required to do their full time of two or three years' military service." I do not think it proper to use the words "pressure was used upon the students." What do you think of that?

A The students did not receive this pleasure, and in this sense I think you can say that psychologically that pressure was applied.

Is it not true that as a result of this system the attendance of students at these military training and lectures increased, not because of pressure but because attendance would shorten their years of military service?

A The students would certainly have been much more pleased if they could have conserved the privileges they had before; that is to say, not to attend such leatures and only have one year's service.

THE PRESIDENT: Before we recess, I will appeal to counsel for the accused to put shorter

questions in cross-examination. Seeing they have had the examination in chief or the affidavit before them for some time, they should be in a position to do this. We will recess now until thirty minutes after one. (Whereupon, at 1200, an adjourn-ment was taken until 1330, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:) . 9

Whalen & Duda

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

MR. OKUYAMA: May this counsel proceed?

THE PRESIDENT: He may.

HYOE OUCHI, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

BY MR. OKUYAMA (Continued):

Q Can you say that the guidance given students by their military instructors at the outset achieved its purposes?

A The purpose may be said to have been reached formally; but, in fact, it had not been reached sufficiently. If the students did not accept this formally, the conditions under which they studied would have been unfavorable. So, they did accept it in the form, but in their minds and hearts they did not accept it.

THE MONITOR: Correction and addition:

Therefore, this education was not successful in that it did not turn the minds of the students
to that end.

Q The affidavit says that the military

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

instructor demanded of the students -- demanded . aggressive war of the students. Did the military instructor actually demand this of the students, to prepare for aggressive war? MR. HAMMACK: Object, your Honor. davit does not so state. Counsel is in error. MR. OKUYAMA: It is so written, and very clearly, in the Japanese translation of the affidavit. MR. HAMMACK: We request, your Honor, that counsel read it in Japanese, because I am quite certain that does not appear, that that exact language does not appear in the English translation of the affidavit. MR. OKUYAMA: How is it written? MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, may we refer counsel to Page 2, the end of the second paragraph, on the copy that was furnished to us. MR. HAMMACK: Paragraph 2 in its entirety reads: "Upon the insistence of the War Ministry, military training became a part of all universities, including private universities, such training becom-

MR. WARREN: Here is our copy.

Minister of Education."

ing compulsory in 1938 when General ARAKI became

MR. HAMMACK: Paragraph 2 of the copies given to counsel:

"Military training and lectures were conducted in schools of all grades by regular Army officers, the officers conducting the courses making every effort by lectures, training and propaganda to inspire a militaristic and ultra-nationalistic spirit in the students. It was taught by the military instructors that the Japanese were a superior race, that war was productive, and it was Japan's destiny to rule the Far East, and thereafter the whole world, and that the progress of the nation required the students to be prepared for aggressive wars in the future to accomplish these ends."

I suggest counsel reframe the question, if your Honor please, to comply with the language in the affidavit.

MR. FURNESS: Is the counsel using the language of the document supplied by the prosecution? He is thinking in Japanese, after all.

MR. HAMMACK: He is using the language supplied by the prosecution, if the Court please. I will personally withdraw the objection and let him ask it whichever way he wants.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that is the right course.

25

1 Counsel for the accused may proceed. MR. OKUYAMA: Then I should like to ask 2 3 definitely, how should it be translated? MR. HAMMACK: I suggest, may it please your Honor, the counsel ask the monitor what the interpre-5 tation of the translation is. 7 THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think we will take 8 his answers on the questions. MR. OKUYAMA: I shall reserve that matter and 9 10 proceed. 11 Next, I should like to ask with reference to the Imperial rescript on Education granted in 1890 12 or the 23d year of Meiji: In the affidavit it is 13 said that the rescript itself, is in essence a docu-14 15 ment which inspires a militaristic and ultra-16 nationalistic spirit. Is this true? 17 If the affidavit can be thus interpreted, 18 I have expressed myself not quite correctly. What I wanted to say is that although the rescript was not 19 written in that spirit, it has often been, on the 20 21 contrary, used to mean something else. THE MONITOR: Correction: It has often been 22 23 abused or misused.

Q If so, then do you not think that the Imperial rescript as commonly interpreted and

understood by us is that it lays down the precept of our family life, our social life, and our national life?

A It is so.

Q Then, may I say that the purport of the statement made by you is that the Imperial rescript to soldiers and sailors also was in essence of the same kind?

A That rescript also was meant to state that the military should not meddle in politics. I stated that in spite of this, by military training and the spreading of military ideas, this has been misunderstood or a mistaken interpretation has been given to it, and the persons who taught this misunderstood it themselves.

THE MONITOR: Correction: The rescript did not mean to say that the military must not interfere. In the rescript it specifies that the military must not interfere in politics.

Q Lastly, with reference to the passage relative to the defendant ARAKI between May, 1938 and August, 1939, may I ask whether you got this information directly or whether it was by hearsay?

A I have not heard that directly as a school authority, but I have only heard it indirectly.

25

1	MR. OKUYAMA: That is all.
2	MR. LOGAN: If it please the Tribunal, I
3	have a few questions I would like to ask the witness.
4	CROSS EXAMINATION (Continued)
5	BY MR. LOGAN:
6	Q Did you bring with you today any textbook,
7	any copies of any lectures or documents of any kind
8	which were used by the students which were used
9	by the instructors in instructing the students as
10	stated in your opinion that the Japanese were a
11	superior race, that war was productive, and it was
12	Japan's destiny to rule the Far East, and thereafter
13	the whole world, and that the progress of the nation .
14	required the students to be prepared for aggressive
15	wars in the future to accomplish these ends?
16	A Although I cannot give them here offhand,
17	many magazines, newspapers, and pamphlets put out by
18	the so-called "Rightists" at the time could be
19	mentioned.
20	MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, may I
21	ask that that enswer be stricken from the record and
22	that the witness be directed to answer yes or no. It
23 .	is a very simple question.

THE PRESIDENT: Better answer yes or no.

THE WITNESS: I should like to have that

question repeated.

(Whereupon, the last question was read by the official court reporter.)

THE WITNESS: I shall now answer that question. I have not brought such books and papers with me here. But the question as previously put to me did not state that clearly. It appears that there was a mistake in interpretation.

- Do you know of any official governmental textbook containing these opinions that you have set forth in your affidavit?
 - Such textbooks have never been printed. A
 - When did you graduate from the university? Q
 - The second year of Taisho; that is, 1912. A

16

23

24

Wolf & Spratt

Q Prior to 1912, according to your affidavit, military training was not intensified in the Japanese public schools, is that correct?

A Generally speaking, such training was not intensified during the recent ten some odd years.

THE PONITOR: Correction: Generally speaking, compared to the recent ten odd years, the training at that time was not as intense as the recent ten years -- odd years.

Q Then you have no personal experience as a student up to 1912 --

A No.

MR. LOGAN: (To Interpreter) I wish to complete that. I had not finished my question.

Q You had no personal experience up to 1912 that the military training lectures and teaching given to students in all grade schools and universities had the effect of creating in the students a militaristic and ultra-nationalistic spirit, a belief that the Japanese as a race were superior to all other peoples, glorification of war; that wars were productive and necessary for the future welfare of Japan, and had the effect of preparing the students for future wars of aggression, is that correct?

THE PRESIDENT: You can ask him whether what he has already sworn is correct or suggest reasons why you think it is not correct, if you think of any. This is a frightful waste of time. All afternoon I have never felt less informed about any question than I have about this; nafter listening to this this afternoon. It is getting us nowhere.

THE WITNESS: May I reply to that question --but the question still has to be interpreted.

MR. LOGAN: May I hear his reply, your Honor? THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I will take his reply.

What we want to know, of course, is what was taught in the Japanese schools at any relevant period, and what was the effect of what was taught. I think that eventually we will have to judge the effect by what happened and not by the opinions, even of professors.

MR. LOGAN: I will withdraw the question on that basis, then, your Honor.

of opinion as to what the meaning of the textbooks was, or what the meaning of the propaganda was, if there was such propaganda, we will have to judge by results. The most useful thing learned this afternoon was that there were nottextbooks.

4.

prosecution.

24

25

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: May it please the Tribunal, 1 I wish to ask just two questions of a formal nature, 2 of the witness. 3 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 5 BY CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: 6 Q Do you recall the date when you signed this affidavit? 8 A I do not remember exactly, but it was about 9 ten days ago. 10 Q Do you remember the name of the person who 11 swore you when you signed this affidavit? 12 MR. HAMMACK: I object to that, may it please 13 your Honor, on the ground that it is improper cross-14 examination, and is incompetent, irrelevant, and im-15 16 material. As to who swore him, the affidavit itself is the best evidence, in the original, as it has the 17 name of the person. 18 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: I withdraw the question, 19 may it please your Honor. 20 THE PRESIDENT: The question is incompetent 21 and will be overruled if it is not withdrawn. 22 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: We can get it from the 23

Q Do you think that the person who interpreted

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Japanese for you was well acquainted with the Japanese language? A Since I made my replies generally in English, I did not particularly notice how the Japanese translation was made. Q Have you heard the translation given by the translation section of this Tribunal today? A That I have not yet seen. Q While the prosecutor was reading the affidavit, did you listen to the Japanese translation which was given by the translation section of this Tribunal today? A I heard it through the earphones. Q Was the translation of this affidavit given by the translation section today the same as the translation which you heard on the day when you signed this affidavit? A I do not know. I cannot say accurately 19 whether or not they were the same.

Q In this affidavit you have stated that upon the insistence of the War Ministry military training became compulsory in 1938. In answer to questions by interrogators today you stated that military training became compulsory in 1939. Which is correct?

A It was the 8th year of Showa, or 1933. 1 It was a mistake. The 14th year of Showa, or 1939, 2 is correct. 3 Q Was there any law that made military train-4 5 ing compulsory in schools in the year 1939? 6 A Whatever the formalities, whether it be an Imperial ordinance, a departmental ordinance, or a 7 8 directive issued by the Ministry of Education, I 9 think there is some kind of regulation. 10 Q Are you positive that such was passed in 11 the year 1939? 12 A You have just used the word "passed." By 13 that you may mean passed by the Diet, but in Japan 14 that procedure is not necessary. Such a rule may 15 be made by other means. 16 THE MONITOR: I know that such a -- it 17 must be that such a regulation was given to the 18 schools in that era. 19 THE PRESIDENT: I cannot allow this to go 20 This cross-examination is of no value at all. 21 You see, if you trap him in a matter like that, it 22 really would not affect his credibility, or the value 23 of his testimony in any way. 24

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: There is an apparent inconsistency, may it please your Honor, that affects

1	me, by my defendant personally, and I wish to clear
2	it up with him inasmuch as there is an inconsistency
3	THE PRESIDENT: If you are going to have
4	every "i" dotted and every "t" crossed in this case,
5	we will never finish.
6	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right, your Honor.
7	THE PRESIDENT: We have heard enough from
8	you.
9	MR. WARREN: No further cross-examination,
10	your Honor.
11	MR. HAMMACK: No redirect, your Honor.
12	(Whereupon, the witness was ex-
13	cused.)
14	In regard to the next witness, Mr. Marshal,
15	will you call Professor TAKIKAWA, and at this time,
16	may it please the Court, the direct examination of
17	this witness will be conducted by Mr. Robert Donihi
18	of the prosecution staff, a lawyer of the Nashville,
19	Tennessee Bar.
20	
21	YUKITOKI TAKIKAWA, called as a
22	witness on behalf of the prosecution, being
23	first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION 1 BY MR. DONIHI: 2 Q Will you state your name to the Tribunal, 3 please? 4 A My name is TAKIKAWA, Yukitoki. 5 Q I hand you herewith a document and ask you 6 if you recognize it? 7 A This is the document to which I have af-8 fixed my signature. 9 Q Was that document first translated from 10 English into Japanese before you affixed your sig-11 nature? 12 A It was translated. 13 Q And are the facts contained in that docu-14 ment true? 15 A They are all true. 16 MR. DONIHI: At this time, if the Tribunal 17 please, the prosecution will introduce in evidence 18 the affidavit of this witness. 19 (Whereupon, the document above re-20 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 21 No. 131, for identification.) 22 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted. 23 (Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit 24 No. 131 was received in evidence.) 25

1 MR. DONIHI: May I read the affidavit at this 2 time? 3 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 4 The Members of the Tribunal would like to have 5 copies. Will you distribute the copies first? 6 MR. DONIHI: I beg your pardon. 7 (Whereupon, copies of the document 8 above referred to were given to the Members 9 of the Tribunal.) 10 MR. DONIHI: This document has been marked 11 exhibit No. 131, may it please the Tribunal. At this 12 time, if your Honor please, it might be well for the 13 witness to be instructed, since he does not speak 14 English, to listen to the Japanese version of the 15 reading of the document on the headphones. 16 THE PRESIDENT: Are they switched on to the 17 Japanese? 18 MARSHAL OF THE COURT: Yes, sir. All in 19 order, sir. 20 MR. DONIHI: (Reading) 21 22 23 24 25

1	"INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST				
2	"THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.)				
3	- AGAINST - AFFIDAVIT				
4	ARAKI, SADAO, et al.				
5	"I, TAKIKAWA, Y., make oath and say as follows:				
6	"I am presently Dean of Law at Kyota Univer-				
7	sity.				
8	"I was educated in the schools of Japan				
9	beginning with the elementary schools and finishing				
10	with the university, receiving the degree of Doctor				
11	of Law. As a student in the Japanese schools and				
12	later as a professor I am familiar with the various				
13	subjects that were taught in Japanese schools from				
14	the elementary schools up to and including the				
15	universities. Military training, beginning in the				
16	elementary schools, was a part of the curriculum of				
17	all schools in Japan.				
18	"Beginning about 1925 more attention was				
19	given to military lectures and training in Kyota				
20	University, there being on the staff teaching military				
21	subjects one colonel and three captains, these				
22	officers being from the War Ministry.				
23	"Gradually the influence of these officers				
24	became more dominant in the schools and they				
25	increasingly had more to say in the manner in				

which the university should be operated. When they first came to the college they did not have a great deal of influence but gradually following the Manchurian Incident in 1931 and the China Incident in 1937 they gained more and more influence, with the result that the university eventually was completely under the control of the military.

"I expressed opposition to the military program in this university, beginning about 1925, not being alone in this opposition other professors also being opposed to this program. At first the officers teaching military subjects did not oppose me openly or discourage my opposition to the military in the schools but working through the War Ministry difficulties were created for me.

"In 1931 or 1932 I wrote an article in opposition to the Manchurian Incident. In 1933 when Hitler came into power in Germany I wrote another article opposing Hitler. At that time, in 1933, the Japanese government was copying Hitler's methods. In the article where I criticized the Nazis before being published it was censored and greatly cut by the Home Ministry.

"In 1932 I wrote a law book in which book I urged that the Peace Preservation Law should not

be invoked for the criminal prosecution of students for liberal thoughts and expressions. Because I had written this book and for my other transgressions, that is, my article in opposition to the Manchurian Incident and article in opposition to the Nazi form of government, I was discharged from the university in 1933.

"Following my retirement from the university
I kept myself well acquainted with the various changes
in the Japanese school system. In Japanese colleges
they do not use many textbooks, but more and more
military ideas and thoughts were incorporated into
the lectures, however.

"I am familiar with the form of education that prevailed generally in the Japanese school system up to the present time and it was a very bad form of education. It completely omitted free thought and liberal ideas and was devoted to justifying Japanese aggressive warfare in Manchuria and China and was intended to teach the students that war was glorious, that war was necessary, that war was productive, that the future greatness and destiny of Japan was dependent upon aggressive warfare and had the effect of inculcating in the minds of the students a contempt for other races and

peoples, a hatred for potential enemies and prepared them for future wars of aggression," Signed: "TAKIKAWA, Y." Sworn to before an officer whose name appears on the original.

25

Q Dr. TAKIKAWA, you have heard the Japanese 1 translation of the affidavit bearing your signature. 2 Is that the same as the translation which was given 3 to you at the time you signed the affidavit? 4 A It is the same except that I have noted this 5 difference: In the English text I am given the 6 title of Doctor. I am not so. My degree is that 7 8 of Bachelor of Arts. THE MONITOR: Of law. 9 Q Bachelor of Law. Dr. TAKIKAWA, are the 10 statements contained in that affidavit, as read to 11 you and as you heard over the translation system, 12 true and correct? 13 A They are all facts. 14 MR. DONIHI: The witness may be cross-15 examined, your Honor. 16 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: May it please the Tribunal, 17 18 I at this time --THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren. 19 MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, may we 20 inquire of the prosecution if that witness has been 21 offered as an expert witness ? 22 MR. DONIHI: Yes, may it please the Tribunal, 23

and in addition to that he has stated he has given

information relative to his own experiences with the

1	school system in being discharged.
2	MR. WARREN: The reason for the question,
3	your Honor, was
4	THE WITNESS: What do you mean by "expert"?
5	MR. WARREN: I suggest to the witness that
6	he has not been asked any questions as yet.
7	The reason for the question was, if the Tri-
8	bunal please, the entire thing was a conclusion; but,
9	if offered as an expert, I take it that the document
10	would be considered by the Tribunal.
11	Shall I proceed?
1,2	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: The document has been received and will be considered by the Tribunal. "e invite you now, Colonel Warren, to cross-examine on the document and on the evidence given from the box, and we ask you not to waste our time with these sheer technicalities.

MR. WARREN: I am sorry. I had not considered it as such.

that this is not a national court in a Serbonian bog of technicalities. "e are here as a military tribunal to see that justice is done in a speedy trial, that the defendants have their case fairly heard. All these technicalities that are being raised here are utterly unnecessary for a fair hearing.

MR. WARREN: I have raised no objection, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. WARREN:

O Mr. TAKIKAWA, this statement which you have heard read, did you dictate that statement yourself?

A Yes.

O To whom did you dictate it?

A Mr. Donihi.

Q Now, you state that beginning about 1925, more attention was given to military lectures and

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

training in Kyoto University, there being on the staff teaching military subjects one colonel and three captains. "ill you explain to the Tribunal what you meant by that statement?

Military training was first introduced into the University in 1925. At that time the War Office assigned superior officers to the University as military instructors. At first military training was limited only to lectures on such subjects as the History of War and Tactics. Training involving the use of arms or drills were not carried on. However, with the passage of time drill, military training as such, was introduced; and such training cut in on the time of the regular school course. At first the military instructors asked the President of the University to provide special hours for such training. However, it so developed that military training took up the hours of the regular course at the University and such training was given without any permission -previous permission from the President of the University. In such a manner a militaristic influence infiltrated into the University.

MR. WARREN: Might I suggest, your Honor, that the witness is not answering the question but is giving us a dissertation on matters that may or may

not be gone into at a later time.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the channel between you and him is the Japanese language, and it may be the translations are not just as you say --

MR. WARREN: Perhaps.

THE PRESIDENT: It is about the same. I will ask him to listen carefully to the question and answer it.

Q What I meant, Dr. TAKIKAWA, was, more specifically, when you stated that more attention was given to military lectures and training in Kyoto University -- what I meant, by way of explanation, had there been military training in the Kyoto University prior to that time, and in what manner was more attention given to it?

A Military training was introduced into the University for the first time in April, 1925.

Q Now, by your statement, "Gradually the influence of these officers became more dominant in the schools, and they increasingly had more to say about the manner in which the University should be operated," will you tell the Tribunal the hold, if any, that these men had on the University, the full extent of their authority, and how far they could go with reference to the control of the University at the

2

3

4

_

,

8

9

10

.....

11

1.2

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

2324

25

the demand of the military members with regard to interference in the administration of the school became

steadily stronger.

time they took over.

Q In what manner did it become steadily stronger?

The school authority rests with the Pres-

ident; but since the introduction of military education,

A At first the hours of attendance to these military training classes were not necessarily compulsory.

THE MONITOR: Correction: "Attendance itself was optional."

A (Continuing) But gradually the interference of the military instructor and other officers became stronger until it reached the point where they insisted that students who do not attend these classes will not be permitted to graduate from the University. For instance, it created the curious situation wherein those who wore long hair were not permitted to attend military classes, and creating a situation where those who wore long hair were therefore not attending classes and were therefore not permitted to graduate.

Q What do you mean by "persons who wore long hair?" Did that mean that those persons belonged to some society that was designed to overthrow the existing

go	***	-	-	-	•	0
50	ve		ш	en	L	

A I don't mean that at all; absolutely not.

In Japan the soldiers are supposed to crop their hair short, and it was considered that students who wore long hair were not acting in a soldierly manner.

Q You left the University by discharge in 1933, is that correct?

A I was suspended from my position on May 26, 1933, and then on July 11 I submitted my resignation and thereby resigned.

Q You state in your affidavit which you dictated that "I was discharged from the University in 1933." Is that statement correct?

A Suspension; in other words, dismissal.

Now, I will ask you if that suspension did not come about as a result of your attack and refusal to cooperate with the new members of the faculty who were military men?

A On the surface, no, but I attacked the system when it was introduced in 1924. Since then, that is, in 1925 when military training was first introduced into the University, there was great opposition within the school; but it was created after an agreement had been made that the course will not be given for more than three years.

1 2

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows, English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation being made by MORI, Tomio and SHIMANOUCHI, Toshiro, Hidekazu Hayashi acting as Monitor:)

S

1.2 1.3

M	1	MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The Tribunal is now				
or s e		resumed.				
	2					
	3	THE PRESIDENT: Major Warren.				
&	4	MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, during				
Abram	5	the recess I have again read this affidavit, and I d				
	6	not believe that we can develop a single additional				
	7	fact of benefit to the Tribunal. Not caring to				
	8	indulge in impeachment examination only, I beg the				
	9	Tribunal's permission to cease cross-examination at				
	10	this time.				
	11	DR. KIYOSE: I should like to put a few				
	12	questions as simply as possible.				
	13	CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)				
	14	BY DR. KIYOSE:				
	15	Q What are you teaching at Kyoto University?				
	16	A Criminal law, criminal case law, and also				
	17	history of law, history of European law, occidental				
	18	law.				
	19	Q During your years as a teacher, has your				
	20	specialty been criminal law and criminal case law?				
	21	A I have taught both those but expecially				
	22	criminal law.				
	23	Q In that case, is it that the educational				
	24	system of Japan, education itself, the subject of				

education, outside of your specialty?

ľ	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	:
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A It is not my specialty.

- Q When did you graduate from the middle school?
- A In the forty-second year of Meiji, 1909.
- Q Then may I take it that education after the year 1942 -- before 1942 -- is outside of your special field of study. Then I inderstand that you did not specially study education since your graduation from the middle school in the forty-second year of Meiji or 1909?
 - A I haven't studied it as a specialty.
- Q When did you graduate from the higher school, Koto Gakko?
 - A In 1912.
- Q Then, may I take it that with respect to the higher school, your knowledge is that which you acquired after graduating from the Koto Gakko or higher school?
 - A It is so.
- Q Then referring to the affidavit, it is said that you say that you wrote an article in opposition to the Manchurian Incident. Then, may I ask the witness that, although you made a special study of criminal law, the first point regarding you is the book called Keiho Tokuhon or Griminal Law Manual, which you wrote, and your criticism of court precedure

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

24

or trials while you were teaching at the Chuwo University which developed into some affair between you and the then Minister of Education, HATOYAMA, Ichiro?

It is generally true, what the defense counsel has now stated, in its general lines correct, but there is a great difference between what transpired officially and what was behind those things.

Whatever the circumstances, you were dismissed in accordance with the law for the dismissal of public officials for your book on Criminal Law Manual and your lecture at Chuwo University criticizing Japanese court procedure. Do you not think it is now improper to make a declaration otherwise?

I cannot accept the causes officially published by the Minister of Education concerning my resignation, nor can the public accept them. The real reason is other. I am not ashamed of having taken an oath, declaring under oath, declaring according to my conscience that these other -- also these other causes.

May I quote from the last part of the affidavit: "Students that war was glorious, that war was necessary, that war was productive, that the

٦	
1	future greatness and destiny of Japan was dependent
2	upon aggressive warfare and had the effect of
3	inculcating in the minds of the students a contempt
4	for other races and peoples." When you speak with
5	reference to future wars of aggression at the end
6	of this paragraph, what do you mean?
7	A Aggressive wars in the future.
8	MONITOR: I would like to hear that.
9	A It is the war to establish the Greater
0	East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere and become its leader.
	Q Do you mean, then, by saying that the
	authorities were anticipating the war as an aggressive
	war before that war began?
	A I believe, I am convinced that from the
	Manchurian affair all the other affairs are aggressive
	wars.
	MONITOR: Correction: Incident.
	Q Then may I take it that the authorities
	instructed their students, before the outbreak of
	the Manchurian Incident or the Pacific war, that
	this was a war of aggression?
	A I do not understand your question very well.
	Q Then I will put it in another way. The
1	Manchurian Incident and the War of Greater East Asia

are, in your opinion, wars of aggression, but it is

not a war of aggression according to the conception of the authorities.

MR. DONIHI: May it please the Tribunal, I understand that to be a statement of counsel rather than the answer of the witness, speaking of wars of aggression or wars not being wars of aggression in the eyes of the authorities, and I do not feel that the examination of the witness is proper or contained within the bounds of the affidavit, the direct.

THE PRESIDENT: I am reluctant to prevent
a Japanese counsel from pursuing his cross-examination
unless it is flagrantly apart altogether from the
subject matter to which he is limited. I cannot
say there has been anything flagrant here. I cannot
say the cross-examination is very helpful either,
but that applies to all the cross-examination that
I have heard today.

Q I divided my question into two parts.

Perhaps that is the cause of the misunderstanding.

You call this an aggressive war after the war broke out. Can it be considered that the authorities considered it to be an aggressive war before it broke out in anticipation of such war?

What the authorities thought that the war would be is of no concern to me. The facts show

it was an aggressive war, and we have to go by the 1 2 facts. DR. KIYOSE: That is all. 3 MR. DONIHI: Is that all of the cross-4 5 examination, your Honor? THE PRESIDENT: Is there any re-examination? 6 MR. DONIHI: There will be no redirect 7 8 examination of this witness. (Whereupon the witness was excused) 9 MR. DONIHI: May it please the Tribunal, 10 11 the prosecution will next, in order to prove this 12 phase of our case, introduce into evidence Imperial 13 Ordinance No. 135, described as "International Prose-14 cution Section Document 7106." 15 (Whereupon, the document above 16 referred to was marked prosecution's 17 exhibit No. 132 for identification.) 18 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the same terms. 19 "Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit 20 No. 132 was received in evidence.) 21 MR. DONIHI: (Reading): "We sanction 22 hereby the ordinance concerning the stationing of 23 Military active officers at schools and order the 24 same to be promulgated. 25

"Ordinance Concerning the Stationing of Officers of Active Status at Schools.

"Article 1. In order to give military training to the male students or pupils of either government or public, normal schools, middle schools, industrial schools, higher schools, preparatory courses of colleges, regular courses of colleges, technical schools, higher normal schools, temporary teachers' training institutions, training institutes of teachers for industrial schools, or training institutes of teachers for young men's schools, officers of active status shall be stationed at these above mentioned schools. However, this shall not be applicable during war, incident, or under other inevitable

"Dispatching of officers according to the regulation of the preceding paragraph will be effected by a conference between the Minister of War and Minister of Education. Officers ordered to station at any school shall obey the order and supervision of the head of the schools concerned with respect to military training.

schools, industrial schools, higher schools,

"Article 2. In order to give military train-

ing to the male students or pupils of private middle

circumstances.

preparatory courses of colleges, regular courses of colleges, or technical schools, or private schools recognized by the provision of Item 1 of Article 100 of the Regulations relative to the application of the Military Service Law, Active Status Officers may be stationed at any school above-mentioned on request from the school concerned.

"The provisions of the preceding paragraph shall be applied with necessary changes in case officers are stationed at schools according to the provision of the preceding article.

"Article 3. The stationing of officers at schools in accordance with this ordinance may be stopped by the War Minister and the Education Minister may break off in case there is a special reason.

"Article 4. The War Minister may order Active Status Officers to inspect the actual training conditions at schools where officers are stationed according to this ordinance.

"Article 5." --

DUDA & WHALEN

THE PRESIDENT: Could you paraphrase that document instead of reading it through? We can read it. Give us a paraphrase if you can, Mr. Donihi, in the future. I know you are not prepared to do it now, but if you have any more documents like that, paraphrase them.

phrase it, then we will not have the simultaneous translation.

THE PRESIDENT: You will have to speak closer to the microphone. You have my fault of talking away from it.

MR. DONIHI: I might suggest this, may it please the Court: Some of these are rather lengthy; and possibly, this evening after Court adjourns, the more lengthy documents can be arranged for simultaneous translation.

THE PRESIDENT: The twenty-eight affidavits as they come, can you cut them down in some way?

MR. DONIHI: I think we possibly can. In most instances we have taken excerpts--

THE PRESIDENT: I seriously suggest you consider whether to tender all those affidavits and witnesses.

MR. DONIHI: Your Honor, we have cut down on

 our witnesses. In fact, there are four witnesses that we had available we are not going to offer in evidence. We knew that the Court was possibly becoming worn listening to the evidence which is of a cumulative nature.

sary, of course; what was taught in the Japanese schools, and so forth, preferably documents. Oral evidence is necessary, perhaps; I do not say that it is not. It may be very necessary. But what we want mainly would be literature, if we can get it. We are told there are no textbooks.

MR. DONIHI: Yes, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: You see, if we get correct translations, we can be trusted to form our own conclusions in the light of what happened. You do not need a mass of material about this.

You must remember that we are not eleven jurors. We are eleven men who can claim to have some experience in weighing evidence and in valuing evidence, and we are not going to be assisted by the raising of technicalities.

Our position is not an easy one. We have to avoid the strict rules of evidence and the strict methods of procedure on the one hand, and Rafferty's

rules on the other. We have to steer between the two, and it is not easy, and we look for the assistance of counsel in this difficult task.

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: If the Tribunal pleases, the prosecution has adopted the method of obtaining the best evidence possible because it realizes that the onus is upon it, as the President has said, to prove this case beyond a reasonable doubt.

We have a number of witnesses to prove a cumulative effect of the education and the propaganda. In the light of what has happened in the last two days, we have been able to cut down on some of that.

We have a number of documents which are about to be put in; and, instead of reading the documents as they stand, it may be possible to put them in with just a brief description of the document. That will not give the defendants—the accused—the information as to what is contained in them if they are not read and if the parts upon which we rely are not read. However, the prosecution will be perfectly prepared to accept the suggestion of the Tribunal and merely read a short description of each document.

THE PRESIDENT: We are determined not to infringe on the substantial rights of the accused.

 We respect them. But we do wish to avoid a waste of time on unnecessary matters.

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: I would point out to the Tribunal--

THE PRESIDENT: May I continue, Mr. Justice Mansfield?

IR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: You refer to the need to read these documents in Court so the accused would know what they have to meet. But I have in mind there are rules under which you must give to them, twenty-four hours in advance, copies of any documents you intend to read, and translations thereof of the parts you intend to read.

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: That has already been done. The object of the prosecution was, if possible, to point out particular parts of these documents upon which we relied more particularly than upon other parts. And I would also mention, with great respect, that the prosecution has taken a great deal-of time in considering the mass of information at its disposal and has endeavored, as far as possible, to sift what it has and to put forth only that which is necessary to present the case as we deem it in its complete form against each accused.

THE PRESIDENT: We appreciate that.

DR. KIYOSE: May I, with the permission of the Court, say that although the Japanese translation of the documents has been presented to the Japanese counsel for the defense, that no documents whatsoever have been delivered to the defendants themselves.

THE PRESIDENT: That is unnecessary. The counsel represents the accused.

MR. LOGAN: If it please the Tribunal, I am taking the liberty of speaking for the defendants, but I think it would be the consensus that we would endeavor to assist the Court in accepting the offer made by the prosecution to the effect that they advise us which articles of any document they intend to rely upon. And I think, if my recollection is correct, that there is some provision to that effect in the rules.

THE PRESIDENT: There are not many rules, but that is in the rules.

MR. LOGAN: Yes. And the documents we have received have not been marked to indicate which portions the prosecution intends to rely upon. But if they will let us know the specific articles on which they intend to rely, I think it would be in accordance with the wishes of the accused, or at least they would

raise no objections; and I prefer reading those docu-1 ments in Court.

I believe we would prefer that method in preference to a summary of the documents.

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: If the Tribunal pleases, these documents which we are now about to produce, we rely upon them in toto. Every provision is, we consider, a necessary one to refer to at some time of the case. Some provisions are more important than others.

MR. LOGAN: Do I understand that the prosecution is relying in toto on the one hundred some odd documents already in evidence and which have not been read to this Tribunal?

MR. JUSTICE MANSFIELD: The documents which have already been produced, some of them have already been referred to in evidence, and those have already been relied upon. In the address of Brigadier Nolan some were referred to. Other documents which have not yet been referred to will be referred to later and will be relied upon in toto. In cases where extracts only from documents are being relied upon, the extracts only have been tendered in evidence.

DR. KIYOSE: Mr. President, I understand perfectly the rules of the Court. Whether or not these

2

3

4

5 6

7 8

9

0

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

•

 documents are entirely delivered to the defendant or not, I can say that, even though summaries are made and great restrictions are made on documents to be read, I still think the proceedings can continue.

THE PRESIDENT: They are certainly going to continue. Because we are convinced of that, we want the full cooperation of counsel on both sides.

We are here to do justice to the defendants, and we feel that, being in that position, we are entitled to the full cooperation of counsel on both sides.

MR. DONIHI: With the Tribunal's indulgence, I shall describe the document briefly and introduce it for an exhibit in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Well, if you think that it is necessary to read the whole document, you exercise your own judgment in the matter.

MR. DONIHI: No, your Honor, it will not be necessary. At a later time we may refer to such portions as may become pertinent.

MR. FURNESS: Are the documents just referred to considered as an exhibit in evidence? I object, for SHIGEMITSU, to any characterization of the documents by the prosecution. It seems to me equivalent

1	to testimony as to its effect.
2	THE PRESIDENT: Oh, that objection is trivial,
3	and it is overruled.
4	MR. DONIHI: May it please the Tribunal,
5	prosecution will next in order of proof on this phase
6	of the case present in evidence document No. 7107.
7	DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT: Marked for iden-
8	tification, exhibit No. 133.
9	(Whereupon, the document above
10	referred to was marked prosecution's
11	exhibit No. 133 for identification.)
12	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
13	(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit
14	No. 133 was received in evidence.)
15	MR. DONIHI: This document consists of
16	"Regulations of the Youngmen's Training Institute
17	(Promulgated by Education Ministry Ordinance of
18	April 20, 1926.)"
19	Prosecution will next in order introduce
20	document No. 7109.
21	DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT: Marked for
22	identification exhibit No. 134.
23	(Whereupon, the document above
24	referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
25	No. 134 for identification.)

1	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
2	(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit
3	No. 134 was received in evidence.)
4	MR. DONIHI: This being Imperial Ordinance
5	No. 249, and is the Ordinance of the Youth School
6	Military Drilling Course, dated August 10, 1935.
7	The prosecution will next in order intro-
8	duce prosecution document No. 7110.
9	DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT: Marked for
10	identification exhibit No. 135.
11	(Whereupon, the document above
12	referred to was marked prosecution's
13	exhibit No. 135 for identification.)
14	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
15	(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit
16	No. 135 was received in evidence.)
17	MR. DONIHI: This document of 30 November
18	1938 is an amendment of clauses in the Ordinance
19	concerning the inspection of military training at
20	the young men's schools.
21	The prosecution will next in order intro-
22	duce document 7111.
23	DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT: Marked for
24	
25	identification exhibit No. 136.
	(Whereupon, the document above

1	referred to was marked prosecution's
2	exhibit No. 136 for identification.)
3	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
4	(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit
5	No. 136 was received in evidence.)
6	MR. DONIHI: This document being "Army
7	Ministry Ordinance No. 8, Inspection Regulations for
8	Military Training at Youth Schools" dated 13 August
9	1935•
10	The prosecution will next in order intro-
11	duce document 7112.
12	DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT: Marked for
13	identification exhibit No. 137.
14	(Whereupon, the document above
15	referred to was marked prosecution's
16	exhibit No. 137 for identification.)
17	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
18	(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit
19	No. 137 was received in evidence.)
20	MR. DONIHI: This being "War Ministry
21	Ordinance No. 10," which is a revision of the regu-
22	lations regarding inspection of military training
23	courses in the youth schools, dated 12 April 1940.
24	The prosecution will next in order intro-
25	duce prosecution document 7113.

DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT: Marked for 1 identification exhibit No. 138. 2 (Whereupon, the document above 3 referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 4 5 No. 138 for identification.) THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual 6 7 terms. 8 (Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit 9 No. 138 was received in evidence.) 10 MR. DONIHI: This exhibit is an extract 11 from pages 516-517, in the Existing Law and Ordin-12 ance of the Educational Ministry, June 29, 1938, 13 entitled "For the Cultivation and Enlightenment of 14 Students and Pupils Through the Faculty Members of 15 the Schools Concerned in View of the Present Situa-16 tion." 17 Prosecution will next in order introduce 18 prosecution document 7114. 19 DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT: Marked for 20 identification exhibit No. 139. 21 (Whereupon, the document above 22 referred to was marked prosecution's ex-23 hibit No. 139 for identification.) 24 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 25 (Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit

No. 139 was received in evidence.)

MR. DONIHI: This being "The Imperial Rescript on Education" dated the 30th day of the 23d year of Meiji, that being 1897. The prosecution has no further documents to introduce at this time. Mr. President, would the Tribunal prefer to hear more evidence this afternoon at this late hour? THE PRESIDENT: No, this is a convenient break. We will recess now until thirty minutes past nine tomorrow morning. (Whereupon, at 1555, an adjournment was taken until Thursday, 20 June 1946, at 0930.)